



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| | | | |
|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| SERIAL NUMBER | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED APPLICANT | ATTORNEY DOCKETT NO. |
|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|----------------------|

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

14

DATE MAILED:

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) JANELLE WAACK (ATTORNEY) (3) MICHAEL PAK (EXAMINER)
(2) DOUGLAS ISHII (APPLICANT) (4) _____

Date of Interview 8-3-98

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☒ Yes ☐ No. If yes, brief description: ATTACHED INTERVIEW PROPOSED

OUTLINE.

Agreement ☐ was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. ☒ was not reached.

Claims discussed: PENDING CLAIMS

Identification of prior art discussed: LEWIS et al. (1317 ~~1060~~); GLUCKMAN et al. ('460)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: APPLICANT REQUESTED THAT THE FINALITY OF THE LAST OFFICE ACTION BE WITHDRAWN SINCE THE NEW CLAIMS RAISE THE SCOPE OF NEW ISSUE UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112(f). DISCUSSED 112(f) enablement - APPLICANT AGREED THAT THE IGF TREATMENT IS A MODEL FOR ALL NEURONS. DISCUSSED 102(e) - APPLICANT AGREED THAT LEWIS et al. DOES NOT TEACH PARENTERAL ADMINISTRATION OF IGF WHICH CROSSES BLOOD BRAIN BARRIER. (CONT'D ON 2nd pge)

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☒ 1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., Items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

☐ 2. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Michael D. Pak
Examiner's Signature



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| | | | |
|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| SERIAL NUMBER | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED APPLICANT | ATTORNEY DOCKETT NO. |
|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|----------------------|

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

14

DATE MAILED:

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(Continuation of Previous Copy)

(1) (SAME AS PREVIOUS COPY) (3) _____

(2) _____ (4) _____

Date of interview 8-3-98

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☐ No. If yes, brief description: (SAME AS PREVIOUS)

Agreement ☐ was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. ☒ was not reached.

Claims discussed: PENDING

Identification of prior art discussed: (SAME AS PREVIOUS)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: APPLICANT CITED

GLUCKMAN AS AN EXAMPLE OF PATENT CLAIMS COVERING A BROAD RANGE OF
CNS DISORDERS BUT ^{LIMITED} NUMBER OF EXAMPLES AND NO SHOWING OF CROSSING
THE BLOOD BRAIN BARRIER FROM PARENTERAL ADMINISTRATION.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☒ 1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

☐ 2. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

H. D. DATE
Examiner's Signature

EXAMINER: M. PAK
GROUP ART UNIT: 1646
(Hand Delivered to Group Receptionist)

RECEIVED

AUG 03 1998

U.S. PATENT APPLICATION
SERIAL NO. 08/571,802

MATRIX CUSTOMER
SERVICE CENTER

APPLICANT: DOUGLAS N. ISHII

PROPOSED OUTLINE FOR EXAMINER INTERVIEW

- The first Office action dated May 1, 1998 was made final (paragraph 9). Applicant would like to discuss whether making this action final was proper in view of the status of this application as a continuation application filed with new claims.
- The May 1 Office action also sets forth a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Applicant would like to discuss that rejection and the points raised by applicant in the Preliminary Remarks filed April 1, 1998.
- The May 1 Office action also rejects claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lewis et al. (copy attached) Applicant would like to discuss that rejection and the points raised by applicant in the Preliminary Remarks filed April 1, 1998.
- Finally, applicant would like to address the recently issued U.S. Patent No. 5,714,460 (copy attached).
- Applicant would appreciate any comments regarding further action that may place this case in condition for allowance.

Janelle D. Waack
Reg. No. 36,300